

# FILE COPY

RECEIVED

JAN 10 4 00 PM '95

UTAH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

**-BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH-**

In the Matter of the Application  
of PacifiCorp for an Order  
Approving its Avoided Cost Rates

)  
)  
)  
)  
)

**Docket No. 94-2035-03**

Prefiled Surrebuttal Testimony  
of  
**Rebecca Wilson**

Prefiled Surrebuttal Testimony of  
the Utah Division of Public Utilities

January 9, 1995

EXHIBIT NO.	DPU 15R
Case	94-2035-03
Date	1-9-95
Witness	W.S.
Reporter	

---

1 **Q. Please state your name and position and by whom you are employed.**

2 A. Rebecca L. Wilson, Utility Economist with the Utah Division of Public Utilities.

3 **Q. Are you the same Rebecca Wilson who prefiled direct testimony in this case?**

4 A. Yes, I am.

5 **Q. What is the purpose of your surrebuttal testimony?**

6 A. I present the Division of Public Utilities' response to issues raised by PacifiCorp  
7 (Company) witness Rodger Weaver in his rebuttal testimony.

8 **Q. How is your testimony organized?**

9 A. I will first address the Company's proposal to file a standard tariff and the Company's  
10 response to the Division's recommendation that short-run avoided energy costs be  
11 based on 10 average MW of QF generation rather than the 50 average MW of QF  
12 generation proposed by the Company. Secondly, I will address issues raised by the  
13 Company in response to the Division's recommendation that the adoption of a  
14 standard method to compute avoided energy and capacity costs be deferred until we  
15 have an opportunity to review the capability of and results from computing avoided  
16 energy and capacity costs using PacifiCorp's integrated resource planning (IRP)  
17 optimization model, IPM, in RAMPP-4 (the name of the Company's IRP process).

18 **TARIFF AND SHORT-RUN AVOIDED COSTS**

19 **Q. The Company proposes to develop, in conjunction with the Division and any  
20 other interested parties, a draft tariff for submission to the Commission  
21 following a Commission order approving prices in this docket. What is the  
22 Division's response to this proposal?**

23 A. The Division welcomes the opportunity to work with the Company in developing a

1 draft QF tariff with price and eligibility criteria and we concur with the schedule  
2 proposed by the Company.

3 **Q. The Company is concerned that the Division's preference for use of a 10**  
4 **average MW block of QF power, rather than a 50 average MW decrement, in**  
5 **determining short-run avoided energy costs for QF projects under one MW is**  
6 **inconsistent with the Division's consideration of the use of the standard rates**  
7 **in other applications, i.e., demand side resource benefits, review of resource**  
8 **acquisition decisions, and payments to QF's larger than one MW. The**  
9 **Company argues that the Division provides no support for the 10 MW average**  
10 **assumption "as it relates to these other applications". What is your response**  
11 **to these concerns?**

12 A. There is no inconsistency because we do not recommend the use of these rates  
13 without appropriate adjustment for purposes other than for QF projects less than one  
14 MW. As stated on page 6, lines 6-8 of my direct testimony in the context of  
15 discussing secondary considerations when reviewing methods, "To the extent that  
16 standard avoided cost rates are used for other applications, it is important that the  
17 method reflects reality as much as is practicable". And indeed, with respect to the  
18 10 versus 50 average MW discussion, we are not objecting to the Company proposed  
19 differential revenue requirements method used for short term avoided energy costs  
20 but rather to one of the inputs, namely, the 50 average MW because it is not  
21 representative of QF's less than one MW for which this proceeding is determining  
22 rates. If 50 average MW is deemed appropriate for another application, then the  
23 adjustment should be made for that application. As stated in my direct testimony, our

1 primary consideration was to examine methods for QFs less than one MW and to  
2 assure consistency of the method with Commission policy. To elaborate on my  
3 direct testimony, we gave secondary consideration to balancing our desire to have  
4 relatively simple, transparent rates for QFs less than one MW with our desire that the  
5 method be reasonably comprehensive in capturing the value of the small QF  
6 generation in order to improve our confidence that the method is a reasonable  
7 foundation upon which appropriate adjustments can be made for other applications.

8 **IPM-BASED AVOIDED COST RATES**

9 **Q. On pages 3 and 4 of Dr. Weaver's rebuttal testimony, he argues that using the**  
10 **IPM-based method to compute avoided cost rates rather than the Company**  
11 **proposed method "will likely not reflect the most recent generation supply**  
12 **information as well as the Company's proposed method". Do you agree?**

13 A. Possibly. However, we do not think this is a problem. Since the IRP is forward  
14 looking and includes analysis of alternative futures, sensitivity analysis of the avoided  
15 costs to changing conditions could improve confidence that the rates address  
16 changing market conditions over the planning horizon.

17 **Q. On page 6, Dr. Weaver said that "the Company believes it is very important**  
18 **to use a method which is flexible... and can be updated quickly to reflect**  
19 **changes in the marketplace." Do you agree?**

20 A. Not entirely. As I indicated in my direct testimony, it is Commission policy to  
21 consider changing market conditions in setting avoided cost rates. However, I noted  
22 that it is also Commission policy to encourage cost effective small power production  
23 and cogeneration projects. Both of these goals as well as the other stated policy

1 goals must be considered. If rates vary erratically and frequently, this could introduce  
2 an unreasonable amount of uncertainty in revenues to small power producers and  
3 cogenerators and thus discourage project development. IPM-based rates should yield  
4 stable standard rates to the QF but still allow update for changing conditions every  
5 two years with the cycle of IRP analysis. Indeed, the most recent avoided cost rates  
6 for QF's less than one MW formally approved by the Utah Commission reflect 1989  
7 planning assumptions and disastrous results have not been apparent. Because  
8 RAMPP is a biennial process, avoided costs developed through that process would  
9 reflect the changes in the market conditions which are modeled in RAMPP, would  
10 be updated every two years, and would have the added feature of consistency  
11 between avoided cost rates and the Company's long run planning process.  
12 Additionally, alternative futures are analyzed in the IRP which may yield an  
13 understanding of the sensitivity of avoided cost rates to changing market conditions  
14 and changing assumptions, including load growth. It is not clear that avoided energy  
15 and capacity costs for QF's less than one MW will need to be updated more  
16 frequently than every two years because it does not seem likely that changes would  
17 be great enough during the two year period to warrant new rates. This would also  
18 be the case for application to DSR analysis. For QF's greater than one MW, a more  
19 market responsive method may be necessary and we have provided comment on this  
20 issue to the Commission.

21 **Q. On page 4, Dr. Weaver expresses the Company's concern that developing**  
22 **avoided costs through IPM "could result in a litigious process that would slow**  
23 **down an already long IRP process". Do you share this concern?**

1 A. No. I have recommended that the Commission direct PacifiCorp to compute avoided  
2 costs using the IPM model in the RAMPP-4 process and to direct PacifiCorp to refile  
3 an application for approval of avoided costs methods and standard QF rates when the  
4 IPM avoided cost information is available for analysis. It is expected that this analysis  
5 would be provided at the same time the avoided cost rates would be updated  
6 normally. We are not recommending that such avoided cost analysis be required to  
7 be included in the RAMPP-4 published report. It is clear that the Utah Commission  
8 does not have the jurisdiction to require other states to adopt the method or numbers  
9 generated through such analysis. Indeed, the Utah Commission may not prefer the  
10 method or numbers. However, the method and numbers would be subject to broad  
11 analytical review, which would only improve confidence in the IPM method or the  
12 Company's proposed method. Since QF avoided costs are allocated system wide, this  
13 is a multi-jurisdictional issue and since most jurisdictions attend the public IRP  
14 meeting, computing avoided costs through RAMPP-4 would aid in the common  
15 understanding of and confidence in the methods selected and numbers generated in  
16 each jurisdiction.

17 **Q. On page 6 of Dr. Weaver's rebuttal testimony, he states "On pages 10 and 11**  
18 **of Ms. Wilson's testimony she states that the energy component developed by**  
19 **the Company's proposed proxy method is based on the variable running costs**  
20 **of the selected unit." Is this correct?**

21 A. No, there is a misunderstanding. The statement in my testimony noted above, lines  
22 18 to 21 is part of a generic discussion of avoided cost methods. At that point I  
23 discussed the proxy plant method based on long-run marginal costs which is what the

1 Company's proposal is based upon. I did not define the Company's version of the  
2 proxy plant method nor did I compare it to the generic definition. Neither do I take  
3 issue with Dr. Weaver's description of the Company's proposed method.

4 **Q. On page 7, Dr. Weaver argues that the proxy method captures the impact of a**  
5 **QFs contribution over a utility's demand cycle which may be to displace energy**  
6 **generated by base load, cycling and peaking units at any point in time. What**  
7 **do you think of this argument?**

8 A. The proxy method as proposed by the Company provides a "proxy" dollar amount  
9 for QF contributions to capacity and energy. As Dr. Weaver notes (rebuttal, page 7),  
10 an advantage to the proxy method is the relative ease and transparency with which  
11 classification of costs between capacity and energy can be made and therefore  
12 payments to QFs can match the actual capacity and energy provided by the QF. The  
13 key question is whether the value of the proxy resource(s) matches what is actually  
14 being avoided in the system through integration with the QF power. As stated in my  
15 direct testimony, a weakness in the proxy method is that it does not integrate the  
16 contribution of the QF energy into the utility's demand cycle so that the value of costs  
17 avoided correspond to the resource displaced which may change over time and not  
18 always be represented by one "proxy" plant in the dispatch of resources. The  
19 advantage of the differential revenue requirements method computed using a capacity  
20 expansion model (as in RAMPP) is that it will reveal the value of the impact of QF  
21 generation on the utility's least cost dispatch, and thus on minimizing total costs to  
22 ratepayers. Dr. Weaver notes that the proxy method provides a proper classification  
23 of energy and capacity and therefore QF payments will correspond to the QF

1 contributions of energy and capacity, which is reasonable if the proxy unit(s) reflect  
2 the dollar cost of what is actually avoided by QF power contribution to the system.  
3 This may or may not be the case and is therefore one argument against the proxy  
4 method; i.e., that it can be viewed as arbitrary and may not reflect the magnitude of  
5 the costs avoided, which in turn could result in over or under payment, thus sending  
6 the wrong price signal to the QF generator, and violating ratepayer neutrality.

7 **Q. On page 8 of Dr. Weaver's rebuttal testimony, he argues that IPM does not**  
8 **recognize lumpiness and therefore does not deal with deferral of resources**  
9 **appropriate for avoided cost determination. Does the IPM model have**  
10 **capabilities to deal with lumpiness and can it reveal the delay of resource**  
11 **acquisition?**

12 A. Yes; my understanding is that RAMPP-4 will address the lumpiness problem with  
13 respect to coal units and DSR and possibly other resources like pumped storage. One  
14 way to examine the impact of QF power on changes in the timing of resource  
15 selection through IPM is to analyze multiple runs depicting future conditions with and  
16 without the QF power. If introducing QF power to the model in one run causes a  
17 plant to come on line in 1999 rather than in 2000 in an alternative run without the  
18 QF power, the difference in revenue requirement between the two runs should reflect  
19 the value of this delay.

20 **Q. Could you summarize the key issues in your surrebuttal testimony.**

21 A. Yes, there are six items to emphasize: 1) The Division supports the Company's  
22 proposed schedule to present a draft tariff for standard QF rates for Commission  
23 consideration; 2) the Division's primary consideration in examining avoided cost



1 methodologies was for its application to QF units less than one MW in size, and  
2 secondarily for other applications of the rates; 3) the Division does not consider the  
3 difference in the abilities of either the Company's proposed method or an IPM-based  
4 method to reflect market changes to be material with respect to standard avoided cost  
5 rates for QF's less than one MW in size; 4) the Division does not recommend that  
6 IPM-based avoided costs be required to be published in the RAMPP-4 document;  
7 5) the Division considers the IPM-based approach to have an advantage over the  
8 proxy approach in the ability to capture the impact of a QFs contribution over a  
9 utility's demand cycle with respect to the resources avoided or delayed; 6) the  
10 Division notes that the "lumpiness" issue will be addressed in RAMPP-4.

11 **Q. Does this conclude your surrebuttal testimony?**

12 **A. Yes.**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on the <sup>th</sup> 9 day of January, 1995, a true and correct copy of the foregoing Surrebuttal Testimony was mailed, postage pre-paid, to the following:

**STEVEN F ALDER**

Assistant Attorney General  
#3 Triad Center Suite 475  
355 West North Temple  
Salt Lake City UT 84180-1204

**STOEL RIVES BOLEY JONES & GREY**

Edward A Hunter Jr., Esq.  
One Utah Center  
201 South Main Street Suite 1100  
Salt Lake City UT 84111-4904

**PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER**

F Robert Reeder, Esq.  
201 South Main Street #1800  
P O Box 11898  
Salt Lake City UT 84147

**CALLISTER DUNCAN & NEBEKER**

Brian W Burnett, Esq.  
10 East South Temple #800  
Salt Lake City UT 84133

**VAN COTT BAGLEY CORNWALL & MC CARTHY**

John T Nielsen Esq.  
50 South Main Street Suite 1600  
P O Box 45340  
Salt Lake City UT 84145

**KIMBALL PARR CROCKETT & WADDOUPS**

Gary A Dodge, Esq.  
185 South State Street Suite 1300  
P O Box 11019  
Salt Lake City UT 84147

**LAW FUND ENERGY PROJECT**

Eric Blank Senior Attorney  
2260 Baseline Road #200  
Boulder CO 80302

**BRICKFIELD BURCHETT & RITTS**

Peter Mattheis, Esq.  
1025 Thomas Jefferson Street NW  
Eighth Floor West Tower  
Washington DC 20007

**PARSONS DAVIES KINGHORN & PETERS**

Glen E Davies  
310 South Main Street Suite 1100  
Salt Lake City, UT 84101

**MICHAEL GINSBERG**


Assistant Attorney General  
**Division of Public Utilities**  
4120 State Office Building  
Salt Lake City UT 84114

**KENT WALGREN**

Assistant Attorney General  
**Committee of Consumer Services**  
4120 State Office Building  
Salt Lake City UT 84114

**BRICKFIELD BURCHETT & RITTS**

Peter Mattheis, Esq.  
1025 Thomas Jefferson Street NW  
Eighth Floor West Tower  
Washington DC 20007

  
Barbara W. Gardner